

Application No. 10/784,163  
Reply to Office Communication of July 26, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 93-102 are active in this case. Claims 93-102 are supported by original claims 71-80 and the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added.

As noted above, Group VI has been elected with traverse. The added claims depend directly from the claims of Group VI and therefore are believed to be covered by this election. The Election of Species Requirements set forth in the Action were not applied to Group VI and therefore no species election has been made.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are either independent or patentably distinct. The burden of proof is on the Office to provide reasons and/or examples to support any conclusion with regard to patentable distinctness. MPEP §803.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that adequate reasons and/or examples have not been provided to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the identified groups.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that the Office has not shown that a burden exist in searching all of the claims. Accordingly, and for the reasons presented above, Applicants submit that the Office has failed to meet the burden necessary in order to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

An action on the merits and allowance of the claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Daniel J. Pereira, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,518

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)